

Serial No. 10/647,851

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chisholm.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 6 is deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 6 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the amended claims 2-5, 7 and 8 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Chen Jiunn Liang et al.

Dated: September 21, 2005.

By



Alan D. Kamrath

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.

Attorneys for Applicants

900 Second Avenue South

Suite 820 International Centre

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 392-7306

Facsimile: (612) 349-6556